Cole R. Gibson. An Assessment of the Usage of Content Standards in the Creation of MARC Record for Derivative Materials. A Master's Paper for the M.S. in L.S degree. July, 2017. 48 pages. Advisor: Caroline Keizer

Cataloging derivative materials is a complex and time-consuming process. Derivative materials often contains multiple entities who are responsible in some way for their creation and those entities are often not credited properly. With the introduction and use of RDA, and the growing awareness of FRBR standards these issues are becoming increasingly important. This research examines how MARC records are being created for these derivative materials and how they address the concepts of a work, expression, manifestation, and item as well as investigating the ways in which catalogers attempt to give proper attribution.

Headings:

Anglo-American cataloguing rules.

Descriptive cataloging – Rules.

MARC formats

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE USAGE OF CONTENT STANDARDS IN THE CREATION OF MARC RECORDS FOR DERIVATIVE MATERIALS

by

Cole R Gibson

A Master's paper submitted to the faculty
of the School of Information and Library Science
of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Science in
Library Science.

Chapel Hill, North Carolina

July 2017

Approved by

_____

Caroline Keizer

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

If there have been creators there have been individuals who have taken the original concept of a work and used portions of that work to create something new and innovative with it. For music, there have been countless re-creations of popular songs from countless artists performing variations of the same song or an artist taking a portion of a song to make something new, such as with Vanilla Ice's "Ice Ice Baby" which was based on Queen and David Bowie's "Under Pressure". In literature and film there is an abundance of stories that have been told in one medium and transferred to the other, as well as what seems to be an unending stream of remakes of popular movies and TV shows. Derivative works exist in a symbiotic relationship with the works that is beneficial for both the creators of the original work and the creation of new creators.

As the Internet has entered into the public consciousness and everyday life there has been a growth in the ability for individuals to create these derivative creations and share them with others. An aspiring author could take to a blog site to share a new fan-fiction piece, musicians can record and upload their own cover performance of a popular song to SoundCloud, and a fledging director could take scenes from popular TV shows and films and edit them together to create a completely new story and post them to YouTube. As the creation of these new derivative items continue to become more open to individuals and they are taking more and more from different works, it is becoming an increasingly difficult challenge for the original creators who often own the copyright for

the materials that are being used. A growing struggle has developed over the legality of these "parody" creations as well as proper attribution for where the material is coming from and who is the true owner of them.

Original owners are not the only individuals who should be interested in how these new digital derivative works are being treated. In much the same way that the former physical examples need to be examined by information professionals, these Internet based materials need to be examined to ensure that proper classification is being done. In the past librarians and catalogers have used Machine-Readable Cataloging records (MARC) and the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR) to help situate derivative materials within a useful paradigm. This study will look at cataloging records for a small collection of Internet-Based derivative materials and examine how these MARC records are being used to classify the materials in addition to how these records are incorporating FRBR into the information that is recorded.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Background on Cataloging

Cataloging has a long history of attempting to classify information to better organize and reveal information to patrons. Cataloging began as a simple listing of books that a library or individual owned. As most collections were relatively small this was an effective method for many years. Descriptive cataloging became popular in the mid-19th century with Antonio Panizzi's "91 Rules for Compilation of the Catalogue" and Charles Cutter's "Rules for a Printed Dictionary Cataloging", to the current standards in use today such as AACR2 and RDA.

Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules (AACR) came into existence in 1967 after decades of work to revise previous rule sets. The rules defined basic principles that would instruct the cataloger on how to assign headings for works including author, title, and other descriptors. AACR remained the leading standard for cataloging in English speaking countries with revisions every decade including the second edition (AACR2) in 1978 that included rules on how to work with non-monographic materials such as electronic files and physical artifacts. Each subsequent revision continued to add in new chapters or revise existing chapters to reflect the change in materials that were being cataloged such as a revision in 1998 to the electronic resources and in 2002 with revisions to Cartographic Materials and Continuing Resources.

In 2004, work on Resource Description and Access (RDA) began and in 2010, it was published and released. RDA was developed as a replacement for AACR2. RDA was specifically built to describe materials using digital technologies, just as AACR2 was built for card catalogs where descriptive space was limited and details were often lacking due to size of the cards and card catalogs. RDA has been thoroughly adopted by many libraries and other information repositories around the world. An important part to RDA's design is the use of the Function Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR) model and thus to understand RDA it is vital to understand FRBR.

FRBR is a conceptional model of information that breaks up each resource into distinct levels of representation: Work, Expression, Manifestation, and Item. A work is an intellectual concept or artistic creation; an expression is the how that work is being expressed or realized; a manifestation is the physical form of that expression; and an item is a singular physical item. For a clearer example, one can think of William

Shakespeare's Hamlet as an entity. The work is the overall concept of Hamlet, a young Danish prince's journey of self-discovery and revenge. The expression would be the form or language that is being used to realize the concept, such as the play script that Shakespeare wrote, the Mel Gibson film version, or a translation into another language. The manifestation would be similar to the information that a traditional AACR2-based catalog record would supply such as edition statements, publisher information, and printing dates. Finally, an item would be the physical item that the cataloger or individual is holding. FRBR also has clearly defined attributes for people, corporate bodies, events, places, objects, and concepts in order to accurately describe each possible piece of information available and to place it in context. In addition to describing an individual information resource, FRBR outlines different possible relationships between each of these representations, both within the same work as well as between different works. These relationships will be important to remember when discussing derivative works later.

Returning to the overview of RDA, the rule set maintains the descriptive elements that AACR2 used, now repackaged under attributes of manifestation and items, and expands to include information about the work and expression. Its third section is dedicated to discussing how to record and identify persons, family, and corporate bodies while the fourth section deals with concepts, objects, events, and places. The last five sections all deal with the relationship attributes that FRBR has outlined with each section focusing on a different type of relationship such as subject relationships, the relationships between the FRBR representations, and the relationships between persons.

While content standards, like AACR2 and RDA, have been in development and revision for much of the latter half of the past century, the encoding standard that is Machine Readable Cataloging (MARC) standard has been in constant use since the 1960s. Developed by Henriette Avram, MARC uses numeric codes to identify specific fields within a catalog record. For instance, a 100 field is the author field and the 245 field is the title field. Each field also contain multiple subfields to further enhance the description; such as using a subfield "e" in the 100 field to denote the relationship between the person and the work. In recent times, there has been a call to remove MARC due to its age and accessibility. Currently there is a beta program known as BIBFRAME in development by the Library of Congress that will use Resource Description Framework (RDF) though its use of FRBR and RDA standards is uncertain.

FRBR, Cataloging, and Further Uses

As FRBR is a relatively new arrival in the cataloging world there have been several articles exploring whether it could help alleviate some of the problems that catalogers face. In Tillett's article "FRBR and Cataloging for the Future", she states that FRBR is less a replacement for current methods and practices but rather something that can be used to strengthen the current principles being used as well as to rediscover information about the bibliographic records that are currently in use. She does state that while there is a learning curve with the new model such as confusion with incorporation into MARC records by some catalogers, the advances will outweigh any current hiccups.

An earlier article by Albertsen and Nuys discusses a project that proposes to collect, classify, and preserve digital resources on the Norweigian Internet domain ".no" and any Norwegian sites and documents that are on the more common ".com, .org, and .net" domains. Central to this project is the FRBR model as it was used to form the foundation of the organization and presentation of the digital documents. They use the relationship elements of FRBR as well as the basic representation levels to derive meaning from the dynamic works that populate the Internet. While they recognize that many distinct types of relationship are present within FRBR they do make note that some relationships need to be created or more explicitly defined. A couple examples of these would be the dependence property, the Extension class, and the BasedOn class. In conclusion Albertsen and Nuys stated that working with the FRBR model will be an effective way for digital documents and non-digital documents to be classified and organized. They do state; however, that some relationships and reinterpretation of some of the concepts will be required. They stress that even with these adjustments there will be a minimal effect on the FRBR model.

Returning to the few attribute relationships that Albertsen and Nuys pointed out, specifically the BasedOn class, we see that there is a struggle with working with materials that are related with original works by extension whether this be by direct copy, selective copy, or creative reimagining. Timothy Dickey expounds upon this in his article "FRBRization of a Library Catalog." Dickey notes that a strength of FRBR models is the ability to link between related items using the various bibliographic relationships that FRBR helps to draw out of the record. He goes on to show that often music cataloging needs to be aware of the relationships between different entities and that these complexly

related entities are most often found in audio-visual collections. He concludes that FRBR can help to expand upon current catalog access and enhance the retrieval that the patrons are experiencing. This is due, according to him, to FRBR being able to help to navigate through the problems of simple keyword searching as well as more accurately reflect how items are related with one another.

As has been recognized by both Dickey and Albertsen and Nuys, there is a growing trend to address issues with how different entities are in fact related to one another and they each recognize that FRBR has a strength in drawing out relationships between entities. However, there is little discussion on materials whose relationships are more derivative in nature. For instance, what if a piece of music copies the melody of a song but changes the lyrics? How would this affect the classification of the piece in a library catalog? Fortunately, there has been some research into how FRBR would work with this type of work as well as the impact that it would have on the catalog record.

Cataloging for Derivative Materials

Before outlining the research that covers how FRBR and RDA work with derivative works it would be useful to examine what exactly a derivative work can be. Michael Falgoust wrote an article detailing several types of derivative works as well as exploring the rights that the creators of such derivative works have. Falgoust explains that at the most basic level a derivative work is something that contains substantial elements of another work. He goes on to explain that there is also a strong and weak sense of derivative. A strong derivative work would use the main characters or setting of a book as

you often see in fan-fiction pieces. A weaker derivative would, for example, use tropes of an instance of a genre. With this in mind the research dealing with FRBR, RDA, and derivative materials can now be fully explored.

In Kishimoto and Snyder's article "Popular Music in FRBR and RDA" there is a discussion of the difficulties that appear when working with the derivative nature of popular music as well as a suggestion on how to effectively navigate this obstacle. In the article, they discuss the FRBR concept of a work and how that can create problems for a cataloger. They argue that due to the nature of popular music there are often cover pieces that can have incredibly long attribution lists if they were fully explored and drawn out. This is especially true due to the current RDA practice uniquely identifying the work. They also point out that often there is a mismatch in who should be accredited in terms of both ease of access for the searcher, as well as, through what RDA dictates to be an acceptable practice. They use the example of Robin Thicke's "When I Get You Alone" to emphasize this point. For this piece, they outline that it is Thicke's lyrics, overlaid on top of Walter Murphy's "A Fifth of Beethoven", which is an adaptation of Beethoven's fifth symphony. To make matters even more complicated the song credits Walter Murphy as the composer which would make the catalog record list Walter Murphy as the main artist on the piece instead of Robin Thicke when working in accordance to RDA's rules. This attribution would make user access to the piece incredibly difficult. Another difficulty would be with pieces that are parody pieces such as "Weird Al" Yankovic's many covers. If RDA was followed, each piece would be credited to the original composer. In the case of his "Like a Surgeon" piece it would be incredibly difficult for users to find as it would credit Billy Steinberg the actual composer of the song "Like a Virgin" which Madonna

performed and Yankovic parodied. Kishimoto and Snyder do offer a solution that could modify the RDA rules, which is like Albertsen and Nuys' own adaption to the FRBR model.

Their solution would be to treat a performance of a popular song as a new work that is based on the previously composed song. They would then treat the most prominently presented entity as the main creator and assign the other creators to alternative authority fields including a "Based on (work)" tag. If we return to their example of the "Like a Surgeon" song we see that it would list Al Yankovic as the creator of "Like a Surgeon" with both Madonna and Billy Steinberg receiving an alternative authority field and a "Based on (work) tag".

Research Goals

While much of the research has covered how FRBR can be applied to information resources to describe the relationships that can exist between entities there has been very little research done that examines how derivative materials are being actively described in catalogue records. Most of the research is being done based solely on the rules and procedures set out by FRBR, RDA, and MARC standards with little exploration into the practices of catalogers' interpretation of the rules. There is also a lack of depth when it comes to which derivative materials are being examined with the majority being within the music genre. With the Internet becoming a holding ground of several types of creative works, such as image and video memes, machinima and film adaptations, and fan-fiction pieces, it would be beneficial to see how these items are being collected and classified for future use. This paper hopes to answer how catalogers are using and interpreting content and encoding standards such as FRBR, AACR2, RDA, and MARC to classify and

describe Internet based derivative materials. It also hopes to outline how these standards have been adapted and replaced through the decade that the Red vs Blue video series collection allows.

METHODOLOGY

I've chosen to use content analysis to investigate how derivative materials are being classified and what FRBR standards are being incorporated into cataloging records. While content analysis can be either quantitative or qualitative in nature I've chosen to focus on quantitative content analysis. Due to my sample size and the predominant practice of copy cataloging, a quantitative method study will focus my research on how catalogers are using the MARC record field restraints to create a detailed record (Kothari 2004). Quantitative methods also allow for easier comparison between individuals in a sample which will facilitate a better understanding on how catalogers are creating and adapting records to fit their institution's needs. Content analysis has been used successfully when interpreting catalog records as well as with interpretation of FRBR (Eklund 2009, Greenberg 2012).

Data collection (population, sample, criteria)

The population for my study is any material that has been created and shared through the Internet using materials that are not owned by the creator. This would include fan-fiction pieces of literature, meme images, machinima videos, and music covers and parodies. An approachable example of an item that falls into this population would be the

EL James “50 Shades of Gray” novel series or image memes such as “Doge” or “Bad Luck Brian”. The sample that I covered is a sample of convenience as catalog records for Internet based materials are either extremely rare or non-existent at this point. Due to this I used the Red vs Blue machinima series which has been released in a physical format and collected and classified by libraries. The series has released 14 DVDs at the time of writing and I used OCLC WorldShare catalog to gather the master catalog record for each of the DVDs. I then looked at OCLC partnered institutions who held the respective DVDs and from this list I browsed the available catalogs to obtain their local MARC records. In total, this resulted in a sample of 14 master cataloging records and 72 local cataloging records that are classifying the 14 DVDs. These records were examined to see which MARC fields are being used to classify the DVDs, as well as examining what was entered in these fields.

Analysis

After the data was collected, I inputted the data into an excel document to make the data easier to compare. I then created a codebook that consisted of 22 descriptive fields that could potentially contain information that will be used to describe derivative materials in terms of FRBR as well as to handle the different levels of attribution that are common in these types of materials. The 22 descriptive fields that were used covered a wide range of descriptions that could get at multiple different levels of detail. Below I will go into a brief description of what each field’s prescribed uses are when describing materials for cataloging but I have included an example MARC record in Appendix 2 for a more drawn out example of what information can be entered.

In terms of attribution, 7 of the 22 fields were selected because the information dealing with attribution was likely to be found within these fields. In the 1XX and 7XX fields, the catalogers could enter the main creator or subsequent creators. Each of these fields also contained multiple subfields; the subfield "e" was selected as that would allow the cataloger to enter in information about the relationship between the person and the work. The 245 field was also selected for study as while its foremost purpose is to provide title information for the piece it also contains the subfield "c" which is also used to list the statement of responsibility for the piece. A 508 field was selected as it is used to enter in a creation or production credit for a production which fits into my sample very well. In a similar vein, the 511 field is the field that catalogers would use to enter in any participants or performers who were involved with a production. Finally, the 610 and the 697 fields were included as they are added fields that deal with corporate bodies with the 610 being an official subject field while the 697 fields are used to add in a locally created subject.

The other 16 fields were selected because information dealing with FRBR standards and the concepts of a work, an expression, a manifestation, and an item were likely to be found within these fields. The 500 field was chosen as it is a general-purpose note field which allows the cataloger the ability to enter in any information that was deemed valuable but that does not have a uniquely defined MARC field where it can be entered. The 518 field was selected as its purpose is for the date, time, and place of an event to be entered. This is useful as it can describe the creation associated with an event which with derivative materials can be varied. The 520 field was selected because it is designed to be used as a summary note field which can facilitate describing the nature of

the material in a greater scope. A 521 field was also included as it is the target audience note. While the use of this field may be limited with some derivative items, my sample makes use of a material that has a detailed age rating so it is possible that a cataloger may use this space to create a descriptive level back to the original material. The next field to be examined is the 540 field or the Terms Governing Use and Reproduction Note field. The description of this field according to MARC guidelines allows the possibility for the cataloger to use this field to note the copyrights of the original material and how the derivative material is using that material. Similar to the 540 field, the 542 field was also included as it formally talks about information relating to the copyright status of the item. The 545 field was also included as it can be used by the cataloger to add in biographical or historical data about either an event, institution, or individual related to the work being described. The next field to be entered, the 580 field, is useful when examining the relationships between the different entities. The 580 field is used to express a complex relationship between the described materials and other items. The 380 and 381 fields are directly tied into the interpretation of FRBR and are each used to describe different characteristics. The 380 field is used by the cataloger to define which class or genre the work belongs too and can be used to differentiate itself from other works. The 381 field is then used as a catch all for any other information that could be used to differentiate a work from another work. The next 6 fields are subject fields that can be used to connect the described item to the greater work. The 650 field is a topical subject field that connects to a controlled subject vocabulary and allows the cataloger to describe general terms. A 653 field is similar to the 650 field but it is not connected to a controlled subject vocabulary. The next field used, the 654 field, is a topical term field that is populated

with a faceted vocabulary. The next included field is the 655 field which is used by a cataloger to indicate the form, genre, or physical characteristics of the material. Similarly, the 657 field is examined as it is used to describe the activity that generated the material. The 690 field is the equivalent to the 650 field with the exception that it is locally added and not based on a controlled subject vocabulary. Lastly the 76X-78X fields were examined as they are fields that establish connections between materials in diverse relationships.

Each of the records was examined to see if the fields that were outlined above included mention of any connecting work or connecting entity rather than just for general use. As many of these fields are required according to good cataloging practices they would not accurately depict if a record is attempting to connect the described work to another. Because of this, a list of terms has been generated that will be used to evaluate if a required field is being used to describe a connection between the described work and another work. It will also be used when evaluating if the record is describing different levels of attribution. The list consists of any mention of Halo, video game, game, Xbox, Xbox 360, Microsoft Corporation, machinima, and the phrase “based on”.

FINDINGS

With eighty-six records examined, forty-seven of the records (55%) were using AACR2 rules while thirty-nine (45%) were using RDA rules with all the master records using RDA rules. The seventy-two records that were not master records were collected through library catalogs and this can be a reason for the discrepancy between the master

records and the local records. Often libraries pull a master record into their own system and when the master record is updated the local record is unaffected.

There were several fields that were never used by any cataloger either at the master record level or at the local level. The 1xx fields were never used. A large majority of the 5xx note fields were never used such as the 518 field, 540 field, 542 field, 545 field, 580 field, and 599 field. Within the range of the 3xx fields the 381 field was not used. In the subject fields (6xx), like the 5xx fields most of the field were not used in the description process. In all, the 610 field, 653 field, 654 field, 657 field, 690 field, and 697 field were not used. Finally, the 76x to 78x fields were not used by any cataloger.

Regarding the fields that were used there was a wide range of usage. The fields that were used the most were the 7xx fields with every record using at least one of the 7xx fields. The records used the 700 field, 710 field, 730 field, and 740 fields. The 700 field was used two hundred forty-four times (59% of all 7xx fields), the 710 field was used one hundred fourteen times (28%), the 730 field was used fifty times (12%), and the 740 field was used five times (1%). The subfield “e” in the 7xx fields was used a total of 15 times. The next most used field was the 511 field with seventy-nine out of the eighty-six records (92%) using this field followed by the 245 subfield “c” being used in seventy-four records (86%) and the 650 field which was used seventy-two times (84%). The 500 field was found in sixty-two of the eighty-six records (72%), the 655 field was found in forty-eight records (56%), the 508 field was used in thirty-eight records (44%), and the 521 field was used in thirty-five records (41%). The two fields that were used the least were the 520 field with sixteen uses (19%) and the 381 field which was used only once (1%).

DISCUSSION

This study contributes to research on cataloging practices for derivative materials. These materials widely range in type and size and therefore the practices can vary in terms of what fields are used, what terms are used, as well as how each field can be used to link different materials with the described material. This discussion will reflect on the finding of this study to identify how derivative materials are being handled under AACR2 and RDA rules, how these materials are being described using FRBR methods, and how attribution is being described within each of the records.

This research intended to study how different content standards such as AACR2 and RDA were affecting the formation of MARC records for derivative materials. The research ranged in time frames from 2003 (earliest record in the data set), when AACR2 was at the forefront of content standards to 2016 (last created record in the data set), which takes us through the development and adoption of the RDA standards for cataloging. When examining the master records, we see that all the records including those created before 2010, when RDA was officially adopted, were using the RDA rules. This is due to the ability for records that have been created to be updated and this is the case for these records. In the local records, we also see the occasional RDA record before its adoption and it can be assumed that the respective holding institutions have updated their own records to be in-line with the new standards or the master record.

This study also aimed to look at the MARC record itself and see how each of the fields are being used in describing derivative materials. These materials were described

as either heavily using portions of a previous work in the creation and formation of a new work or by using similar themes or motifs that have been found in previous works. Due to this description, this study chose to focus on how catalogers are describing materials in accordance with FRBR and selected 16 fields that were thought to be of possible use with FRBR specifically. Many of these selected fields were not used in the records and it is uncertain if this is due to the nature of the material not allowing these fields to be used or if these fields were not well suited to describe the materials with FRBR in mind. Of the fields that were used however we can make some observations on how derivative materials are being classified. To begin, the 500 field was the most used field of those that were selected to examine for the concepts of work, expression, manifestation, and item. With the usage of the field being a general note field, this seems to be a good place for a cataloger to enter in how the described material connects with another work. In total sixty-two records were found to have been using this field and upon examining what was being entered into the field a common theme begins to appear among them. Many of the records used the phrase of "Based on the Xbox video game Halo" or something that was very similar in nature to it in the 500 field. Due to the similarity of this phrase it can either be assumed that this standard was adopted at the master level and copied down into the local records or that the material itself had this text on its physical container. The field that was used the next most frequently was the 650 field. The 650 field was used to add in a subject field with a topical term. This field prominently was recognized because of this use of the subject of Halo (Game). This subject seems to be used to create a direct tie between the Red vs Blue video series, the derivative work, and the Halo video game series, the original work, as it was found with most records that used the 650 field. In the

same sense, the 655 field was used frequently as well. The 655 field is used to describe the genre of the material being described and when observed this was often used with the machinima term. A machinima is a cinematic production that is created using computer graphics engines with these engines often being video games. With Red vs Blue being a machinima produced with the Halo engine this term helps to create a connection between Red vs Blue and a work. The next field that was used frequently was the 521 field or the target audience field. This was an interesting field as it is prescribed to contain information about the appropriateness of the described material and would not normally be used to link the material with another entity. However, 35 records used this field by stating that the material was based on a video game that had received a mature rating. While this entry does not create a large connection between the two different materials it does show how catalogers are using various aspects of that connection to better serve their patrons and to better describe the materials by including information about the greater work.

The 520 field, or the summary note, was the next field that was used to show how the described material was linked to another. Like the 521 field this field stood out due to its prescribed instructions to provide a summary of the described material. However, 16 records used this field in some manner to connect the material to the work that it related to. When examining the fields, we see that each of the records entered the same entry into the field, “Red vs. Blue chronicles the ongoing conflict between the red team and the blue team in the Halo map of Blood Gulch.” Because the term Halo was used in the entry, these fields were included. Looking at the entry the tie to another work is there but it is forming only a very loose connection. Also, because each of the records used the same

statement it can be assumed that this text was created by the creator of the material and wasn't intended to represent a high level of description for its connection to the "Halo" work.

The last field that was examined to cover the concepts of a work and was included was the 380 field or the form of work field. Due to the field appearing only once, however, we can assume that this inclusion was an outlier and does not reflect on the greater practices of cataloging.

In addition to the prescribed fields that were to be examined for the usage of FRBR there were also other fields that were observed that showed the connection between the described material and other works. The field that most commonly occurred was the 730 field. While this field was chosen to be observed for attribution it also connected the derivative material to other works. This field is used as a uniform title field as well as a related title field. In the case that has been observed, we see that the entry of "Halo (Game)" has been used in 15 different records. With the described material of Red vs Blue being based and built with the Halo video game series we can assume that the catalogers included this field because the described publication of Red vs Blue is related to the other publication of Halo.

This research was also concerned with discovering how catalogers were addressing the complicated problem of proper attribution within catalog records. With the nature of the Red vs Blue collection containing not only multiple people who were connected with the creation of Red vs Blue series but also that the creation of the series also used the third-party software of the Halo video game series, the different levels of attribution possible were extremely high and varied. This study selected 7 different

MARC fields that could be used by catalogers to credit different individuals and corporate bodies with different levels of creation and connection to the material. Three of these selected fields were not used in the records found. The 1xx fields were not used but due to the immense use of the 7xx fields this could be understood as the catalogers might not wish to assign one individual or entity as the main entry for each title. The other two fields that were not used were the 610 and 697 field. As outlined in the analysis section these fields were related in the sense that they were added subject fields with one requiring a controlled vocabulary and the other being a local variant. With these fields being subject fields about a corporate body it can be understood that the catalogers did not use this space as they did not believe the material was about any specific corporate entity.

When looking at the fields that were used, the 7xx fields were at the front as every record contained at least one. In total, there were four hundred thirteen 7xx fields used with two hundred forty-four being a 700 field (59%), one hundred fourteen being a 710 field (28%), fifty being a 730 field (12%), and five being a 740 field (1%). The 700 field, contained personal names who were related to the creation of the material, the 710 field being for corporate bodies, 730 being uniform titles, and 740 being an uncontrolled related title. The 700 and 710 fields also had the possibility for a subfield “e” to be used with subfield “e” being for describing the relationship. When examining the entries into these fields it becomes clear that the entries are for the individuals were directly tied with the creation of the Red vs Blue series as they seem to be directors, actors, and producers for the series. There were however instances of these fields being used to link to outside works. I mentioned above how the 730 field was used to link the Red vs Blue series to

the Halo games but the 740 field was also used to link Red vs Blue to another work. The 740 field was used in 5 records to link to “Out of Mind”. When examining what this link was it was discovered that “Out of Mind” was a Red vs Blue mini-series created for the creators of the Halo video game series. This inclusion helps facilitate the connection between the work of Red vs Blue and the derived material “Out of Mind” much like has been observed with the Halo work and the derived Red vs Blue.

The field that was also used frequently was the 245 subfield “c”. Being found in 92% of the records it was heavily used by catalogers to enter in various individuals who had some responsibility in the creation of Red vs Blue. Once again, these figures were only directly related to the creation of Red vs Blue and there were no ties linking to other works. Most of the individuals listed were directors or producers for the show. The last two fields examined were the 511 field and the 508 field. As has been a theme for this study these fields only contained individuals who were directly responsible for the creation of the Red v Blue video series. In terms of attribution there was very little done to link other entities who had links to the Red vs Blue series through the third-party software of Halo with only the 730 and 740 fields being used to link the series to other works.

CONCLUSION

When working with derivative materials it is often a complex task to properly situate the material within a greater work and then to properly credit the individuals who are responsible for its creation. MARC however does offer various fields and subfields

that catalogers have used to attempt to combat this complex issue. Catalogers have successfully linked the works of Red vs Blue and Halo together using the 500, 520 and 521 note fields as well as the 650 and 655 subject fields. Each of these fields let individuals know that there is a connection between the two materials either by saying that the series is based upon or about the Halo video game series. In terms of attribution the first-party contributors for the Red vs Blue series have been properly credited for their role. However very little has been done to give credit to those who are related through a third-party or other connection. While linking the series to the Halo game is an important step it may also be useful for the creators of the Halo series to also be given some sort of credit as the game is such a large portion of the filmmaking process. It's possible that MARC records themselves make this attribution process either too difficult or time consuming for the catalogers to effectively do, if not impossible. Further research needs to be done addressing how catalogers themselves find working with MARC records when working with derivative materials. It would also be beneficial for this study to be expanded beyond just one instance of a derivative material as the scope of this study was small and many of the records were copies of the master record with no or very little changes made. With the development of Bibframe it may also be useful for studies to be completed with this metadata transmission standard to see if it changes the process of working with derivative materials.

Bibliography

A Brief History of AACR. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.rda-sc.org/archivedsite/history.html

Albertsen, K., Nuys, C. (2009). Paradigma: FRBR and Digital Documents. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 39(3-4), 125-149.

Dickey, T. J. (2008). FRBRization of a Library Catalog: Better Collocation of Records, Leading to Enhanced Search, Retrieval, and Display. *Information Technology & Libraries*, *27*(1), 23-32.

Eklund, A. P., Miksa, S. D., Moen, W. E., Snyder, G., & Polyakov, S. (2009). Comparison of MARC Content Designation Utilization in OCLC WorldCat Records with National, Core, and Minimal Level Record Standards. *Journal of Library Metadata*, *9*(1-2), 36-64.

Falgoust, M. (2012). Derivative works, original value. *Philosophy in the Contemporary World*, *19*(1), 44-55.

Greenberg, J., Trujillo, S., & Mayer-Patel, K. (2012). YouTube: Applying FRBR and Exploring the Multiple Description Coding Compression Model. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, *50*(5-7), 742-762.

IFLA Study Group on the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records. (1997). FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR BIBLIOGRAPHIC RECORDS Final Report. *UBCIM Publications, 19*.

Kothari, C. (2004). Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques (2). Daryaganj, IN: New Age International.

LibGuides: Cataloging Tools and Resources: Descriptive Cataloging. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://libguides.ala.org/catalogingtools/descriptive

RDA: Resource Description and Access Prospectus. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.rda-jsc.org/archivedsite/rdaprospectus.html

Report of The Library of Congress Working Group on the Future of Bibliographic Control. (2008). *On the Record*.

Tennant, R. (2002, October 15). MARC Must Die. Retrieved from http://lj.libraryjournal.com/2002/10/ljarchives/marc-must-die/

Tillett, B. B. (2005). FRBR and Cataloging for the Future. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly, 39*(3-4), 197-205.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Red vs Blue Series Record Data

This data represents each separate season of the 14 season online series known as Red vs Blue. Each season had a single master record with varying amounts of local records that were available for examination. Each local record is listed by the name of the institution that is holding the material. Each field and subfield is listed by the number used to represent them according to MARC rules and the letter "Y" is used to represent if the field is present in the MARC record while the letter "N" is used to represent if the field is not used. When numbers appear these numbers represent how many times the field appeared in the associated record.

Season 1

RVB Season 1	AACR2 Usage	RDA Usage	1XX	$e	7XX	700	710	730	740	$e
Master	N	Y	N	N	Y	2	1	0	0	N
American	Y	N	N	N	Y	2	1	1	0	N
OSU	Y	N	N	N	Y	3	1	0	0	N
Auburn	N	Y	N	N	Y	3	1	0	0	N
Indiana State	Y	N	N	N	Y	3	1	0	0	N
South Central	Y	N	N	N	Y	3	1	1	0	N
Texas A&M	N	Y	N	N	Y	3	1	0	0	N
Midland	Y	N	N	N	Y	3	1	1	0	N
Stanford	Y	N	N	N	Y	3	1	0	0	N
Urbana	Y	N	N	N	Y	3	1	1	0	N

RVB Season 1	245 $c	500	508	511	518	520	521	540	542	545	580	599
Master	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
American	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
OSU	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Auburn	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Indiana State	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
South Central	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Texas A&M	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Midland	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Stanford	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Urbana	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N

RVB Season 1	380	381	610	650	653	654	655	657	690	697	76X-78X
Master	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
American	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N
OSU	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Auburn	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Indiana State	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
South Central	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Texas A&M	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N
Midland	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Stanford	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N
Urbana	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N

Season 2

RVB Season 2	AACR2 Usage	RDA Usage	1XX	$e	7XX	700	710	730	740	$e
Master	N	Y	N	N	Y	3	1	1	0	N
American	Y	N	N	N	Y	3	1	1	0	Y
Ohio State	Y	N	N	N	Y	2	1	0	0	N
Auburn	N	Y	N	N	Y	4	1	1	0	N
Texas A&M	N	Y	N	N	Y	4	1	0	0	N
Austin	Y	N	N	N	Y	4	1	0	0	N
Midland	Y	N	N	N	Y	3	1	1	0	Y
Stanford	Y	N	N	N	Y	3	1	0	0	N
Waikato	Y	N	N	N	Y	1	1	0	0	N
Urbana	Y	N	N	N	Y	3	1	2	0	N

RVB Season 2	245 $c	500	508	511	518	520	521	540	542	545	580	599
Master	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N
American	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N
Ohio State	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N
Auburn	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N
Texas A&M	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N
Austin	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Midland	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N
Stanford	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N
Waikato	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Urbana	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N

RVB Season 2	380	381	610	650	653	654	655	657	690	697	76X-78X
Master	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N
American	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N
Ohio State	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Auburn	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Texas A&M	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N
Austin	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Midland	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N
Stanford	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N
Waikato	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Urbana	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N

Season 3

RVB Season 3	AACR2 Usage	RDA Usage	1XX	$e	7XX	700	710	730	740	$e
Master	N	Y	N	N	Y	5	1	1	0	N
American	Y	N	N	N	Y	5	1	1	0	N
Indiana State	Y	N	N	N	Y	2	1	0	0	N
Urbana	Y	N	N	N	Y	5	1	1	0	N
Texas A&M	N	Y	N	N	Y	5	1	0	0	N
Stanford	Y	N	N	N	Y	3	1	0	0	N

RVB Season 3	245 $c	500	508	511	518	520	521	540	542	545	580	599
Master	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N
American	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N
Indiana State	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Urbana	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N
Texas A&M	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N
Stanford	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N

RVB Season 3	380	381	610	650	653	654	655	657	690	697	76X-78X
Master	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N
American	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N
Indiana State	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Urbana	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N
Texas A&M	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N
Stanford	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N

Season 4

RVB Season 4	AACR2 Usage	RDA Usage	1XX	$e	7XX	700	710	730	740	$e
Master	N	Y	N	N	Y	3	1	1	0	N
American	Y	N	N	N	Y	3	1	1	0	N
Urbana	Y	N	N	N	Y	3	1	1	0	N
Texas A&M	N	Y	N	N	Y	3	1	0	0	N
Stanford	Y	N	N	N	Y	3	1	0	0	N

RVB Season 4	245 $c	500	508	511	518	520	521	540	542	545	580	599
Master	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
American	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Urbana	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Texas A&M	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Stanford	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N

RVB Season 4	245 $c	500	508	511	518	520	521	540	542	545	580
Master	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
American	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Urbana	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Texas A&M	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Stanford	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N

Season 5

RVB Season 5	AACR2 Usage	RDA Usage	1XX	$e	7XX	700	710	730	740	$e
Master	N	Y	N	N	Y	3	1	1	1	N
American	Y	N	N	N	Y	3	1	1	1	N
Urbana	Y	N	N	N	Y	3	1	1	1	N
Texas A&M	N	Y	N	N	Y	3	1	0	1	N
Stanford	Y	N	N	N	Y	3	1	1	1	N

RVB Season 5	245 $c	500	508	511	518	520	521	540	542	545	580	599
Master	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
American	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Urbana	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Texas A&M	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Stanford	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N

RVB Season 5	380	381	610	650	653	654	655	657	690	697	76X-78X
Master	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N
American	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N
Urbana	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N
Texas A&M	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N
Stanford	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N

Season 6

RVB Season 6	AACR2 Usage	RDA Usage	1XX	$e	7XX	700	710	730	740	$e
Master	N	Y	N	N	Y	6	2	0	0	N
Carnegie-Stout	N	Y	N	N	Y	6	2	0	0	N
Austin	Y	N	N	N	Y	6	2	1	0	N
Pierce	Y	N	N	N	Y	6	2	0	0	N

RVB Season 6	245 $c	500	508	511	518	520	521	540	542	545	580	599
Master	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Carnegie-Stout	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Austin	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Pierce	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N

RVB Season 6	380	381	610	650	653	654	655	657	690	697	76X-78X
Master	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N
Carnegie-Stout	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N
Austin	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N
Pierce	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N

Season 7

RVB Season 7	AACR2 Usage	RDA Usage	1XX	$e	7XX	700	710	730	740	$e
Master	N	Y	N	N	Y	4	2	0	0	N
Carnegie-Stout	N	Y	N	N	Y	4	2	0	0	N
Pierce County	Y	N	N	N	Y	5	2	0	0	N

RVB Season 7	245 $c	500	508	511	518	520	521	540	542	545	580	599
Master	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Carnegie-Stout	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Pierce County	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N

RVB Season 7	380	381	610	650	653	654	655	657	690	697	76X-78X
Master	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N
Carnegie-Stout	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N
Pierce County	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N

Season 8

RVB Season 8	AACR2 Usage	RDA Usage	1XX	$e	7XX	700	710	730	740	$e
Master	N	Y	N	N	Y	4	2	0	0	N
Carnegie-Stout	N	Y	N	N	Y	4	2	0	0	N
Pierce County	Y	N	N	N	Y	4	2	0	0	N

RVB Season 8	245 $c	500	508	511	518	520	521	540	542	545	580	599
Master	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Carnegie-Stout	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Pierce County	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N

RVB Season 8	380	381	610	650	653	654	655	657	690	697	76X-78X
Master	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Carnegie-Stout	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Pierce County	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N

Season 9

RVB Season 9	AACR2 Usage	RDA Usage	1XX	$e	7XX	700	710	730	740	$e
Master	N	Y	N	N	Y	3	3	0	0	N
Anderson	Y	N	N	N	Y	3	0	1	0	N
Indiana State	Y	N	N	N	Y	3	3	2	0	N
Palatine	Y	N	N	N	Y	3	0	0	0	N
Central Arkansas	Y	N	N	N	Y	3	3	0	0	N
Carnegie-Stout	N	Y	N	N	Y	3	3	0	0	N
East Bonner	Y	N	N	N	Y	2	0	0	0	N
Pierce County	Y	N	N	N	Y	3	3	0	0	N
Stanford	Y	N	N	N	Y	3	1	1	0	N

RVB Season 9	245 $c	500	508	511	518	520	521	540	542	545	580	599
Master	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Anderson	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Indiana State	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Palatine	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Central Arkansas	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Carnegie-Stout	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N
East Bonner	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Pierce County	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Stanford	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N

RVB Season 9	380	381	610	650	653	654	655	657	690	697	76X-78X
Master	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N
Anderson	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Indiana State	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N
Palatine	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Central Arkansas	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Carnegie-Stout	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N
East Bonner	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Pierce County	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N
Stanford	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N

Season 10

RVB Season 10	AACR2 Usage	RDA Usage	1XX	$e	7XX	700	710	730	740	$e
Master	N	Y	N	N	Y	1	1	1	0	N
Indiana State	Y	N	N	N	Y	7	1	2	0	N
Vespasian	Y	N	N	N	Y	1	1	1	0	N
Central Arkansas	Y	N	N	N	Y	1	1	0	0	N
Carnegie-Stout	N	Y	N	N	Y	1	1	1	0	N
Pierce County	Y	N	N	N	Y	1	1	1	0	N

RVB Season 10	245 $c	500	508	511	518	520	521	540	542	545	580	599
Master	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Indiana State	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Vespasian	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Central Arkansas	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Carnegie-Stout	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Pierce County	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N

RVB Season 10	380	381	610	650	653	654	655	657	690	697	76X-78X
Master	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N
Indiana State	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N
Vespasian	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N
Central Arkansas	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Carnegie-Stout	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N
Pierce County	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N

Season 11

RVB Season 11	AACR2 Usage	RDA Usage	1XX	$e	7XX	700	710	730	740	$e
Master	N	Y	N	N	Y	1	1	1	0	N
Vespasian	Y	N	N	N	Y	1	1	1	0	N
Nova Southeastern	N	Y	N	N	Y	1	1	1	0	N
Central Arkansas	Y	N	N	N	Y	1	1	0	0	N
Carnegie-Stout	N	Y	N	N	Y	1	1	1	0	N
Great River Regional	N	Y	N	N	Y	1	1	1	0	N
Pierce County	Y	N	N	N	Y	1	1	1	0	N
Stanford	Y	N	N	N	Y	1	1	1	0	N

RVB Season 11	245 $c	500	508	511	518	520	521	540	542	545	580	599
Master	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Vespasian	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Nova Southeastern	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Central Arkansas	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Carnegie-Stout	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Great River Regional	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Pierce County	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Stanford	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N

RVB Season 11	380	381	610	650	653	654	655	657	690	697	76X-78X
Master	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N
Vespasian	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N
Nova Southeastern	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Central Arkansas	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Carnegie-Stout	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N
Great River Regional	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Pierce County	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N
Stanford	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N

Season 12

RVB Season 12	AACR2 Usage	RDA Usage	1XX	$e	7XX	700	710	730	740	$e
Master	N	Y	N	N	Y	3	2	0	0	Y
Central Arkansas	Y	N	N	N	Y	3	3	0	0	N
Carnegie-Stout	N	Y	N	N	Y	3	2	1	0	N
Great River Regional	N	Y	N	N	Y	3	2	1	0	Y
Pierce County	N	Y	N	N	Y	3	2	1	0	Y
Stanford	N	Y	N	N	Y	3	2	1	0	Y

RVB Season 12	245 $c	500	508	511	518	520	521	540	542	545	580	599
Master	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Central Arkansas	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Carnegie-Stout	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Great River Regional	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Pierce County	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Stanford	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N

RVB Season 12	380	381	610	650	653	654	655	657	690	697	76X-78X
Master	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Central Arkansas	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Carnegie-Stout	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Great River Regional	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Pierce County	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Stanford	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N

Season 13

RVB Season 13	AACR2 Usage	RDA Usage	1XX	$e	7XX	700	710	730	740	$e
Master	N	Y	N	N	Y	4	2	1	0	Y
Great River Regional	N	Y	N	N	Y	4	2	1	0	Y
Pierce County	N	Y	N	N	Y	4	2	1	0	Y
Stanford	N	Y	N	N	Y	4	3	1	0	Y

RVB Season 13	245 $c	500	508	511	518	520	521	540	542	545	580	599
Master	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Great River Regional	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Pierce County	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Stanford	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N

RVB Season 13	380	381	610	650	653	654	655	657	690	697	76X-78X
Master	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Great River Regional	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Pierce County	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Stanford	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N

Season 14

RVB Season 14	AACR2 Usage	RDA Usage	1XX	$e	7XX	700	710	730	740	$e
Master	N	Y	N	N	Y	1	1	0	0	Y
Pierce County	N	Y	N	N	Y	7	1	0	0	Y
Stanford	N	Y	N	N	Y	1	1	0	0	Y

RVB Season 14	245 $c	500	508	511	518	520	521	540	542	545	580	599
Master	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Pierce County	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Stanford	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N

RVB Season 14	380	381	610	650	653	654	655	657	690	697	76X-78X
Master	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Pierce County	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Stanford	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N

Appendix 2: Possible Ideal MARC Record for Red vs Blue Season 14

In order to properly communicate how a MARC record is formed and how the fields selected for study could be used for derivative materials, I have created a MARC record for Red vs. Blue Season 14 that uses a majority of the fields that were selected for study. This record was created by adapting the master record that is available from OCLC to include the fields that I had selected but where not originally used.

Example MARC Record Values

007__ v ǂb d ǂd c ǂe v ǂf a ǂg i ǂh z ǂi q

040 __TEFMT ǂb eng ǂe rda ǂc TEFMT ǂd TEF ǂd OCLCO ǂd OCLCF

024 1_ 883476152141

028 42 RT5214 ǂb Flatiron Film Co.

037 __ ǂb Midwest Tape ǂn http://www.midwesttapes.com

050 _4 PN1992.77 ǂb .R43 2016

082 04 791.45/75 ǂ2 23

049 __ NOAA

110 2_ Rooster Teeth Productions $e producer.

245 00 Red vs. blue. ǂn Season 14 / ǂc produced by Funhaus ; directed by Freddy Wong.

250 __ Special edition.

264 _1 [Place of publication not identified] : ǂb Flatiron Film Co., ǂc [2016]

300 __ 1 videodisc (120 min.) : ǂb sound, color ; ǂc 4 3/4 in.

336 __ two-dimensional moving image ǂb tdi ǂ2 rdacontent

337 __ video ǂb v ǂ2 rdamedia

338 __ videodisc ǂb vd ǂ2 rdacarrier

344 __ digital ǂb optical ǂ2 rda

347 __ video file ǂb DVD video ǂe region 1 ǂ2 rda

380 __ Television program

538 __ DVD; Widescreen presentation; NTSC, region 1.

546 __ Closed-captioned.

500 __ Title from web page.

500 __ Based on Xbox videogame Halo.

500 __ Widescreen.

521 _8 Rating: Not rated.

520 __ A collection of numerous short stories, focused on characters both old and new, produced in a variety of styles, and presented by everyone's favorite computer program: VIC. Rooster Teeth has teamed up with writers and directors from around the country to give each piece a unique voice, and the results range from hilarious to action-packed, and everything in between!

500 __ Special feature includes double sided litho featuring original artwork, 4 collector'scards and a 12 page Caboose activity book!

508 __ Directed by Burnie Burns

511 0_ Joel Heyman (Voice)

518 __ Shorts compiled and released in Austin, Texas $d 2016 May to October

540 __ Copyright of Halo videogame is owned by Microsoft Corporation

542 __ $c Rooster Teeth Productions

580 __ Based on Halo video game

610 __ Microsoft Game Studios

650 _0 Halo (Game) ǂv Drama.

650 _0 Soldiers ǂv Drama.

650 _0 Robots ǂv Drama.

650 _0 Imaginary wars and battles ǂv Drama.

650 _7 Halo (Game) ǂ2 fast ǂ0 (OCoLC)fst01739380

650 _7 Imaginary wars and battles. ǂ2 fast ǂ0 (OCoLC)fst00967580

650 _7 Robots. ǂ2 fast ǂ0 (OCoLC)fst01099038

650 _7 Soldiers. ǂ2 fast ǂ0 (OCoLC)fst01125233

653 __ Halo

655 _0 Machinima films

655 _7 Television series. ǂ2 lcgft

655 _7 Fiction television programs. ǂ2 lcgft

655 _7 Animated television programs. ǂ2 lcgft

655 _7 Television comedies. ǂ2 lcgft

655 _7 Action and adventure television programs. ǂ2 lcgft

655 _7 Feature films. ǂ2 lcgft

655 _7 Video recordings for the hearing impaired. ǂ2 lcgft

655 _7 Action and adventure television programs. ǂ2 fast ǂ0 (OCoLC)fst01726304

655 _7 Animated television programs. ǂ2 fast ǂ0 (OCoLC)fst01726128

655 _7 Drama. ǂ2 fast ǂ0 (OCoLC)fst01423879

655 _7 Feature films. ǂ2 fast ǂ0 (OCoLC)fst01710384

655 _7 Fiction television programs. ǂ2 fast ǂ0 (OCoLC)fst01710265

655 _7 Television comedies. ǂ2 fast ǂ0 (OCoLC)fst01710440

655 _7 Television series. ǂ2 fast ǂ0 (OCoLC)fst01710566

655 _7 Video recordings for the hearing impaired. ǂ2 fast ǂ0 (OCoLC)fst01710450

700 1_ Burns, Burnie, $e director.

700 1_ Heyman, Joel, $e performer.

700 _1 Wong, Freddy, ǂe television director.

710 _2 Flatiron Film Company, ǂe publisher.

787 __ Halo (Video game)